OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

In the Matter of)	
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION))) Docket No. 03-0371	
Instituting a Proceeding to Investigate Distributed Generation in Hawaii.	Aug 18 2 PUBLIC UT COMMIS	

KAUAI ISLAND UTILITY COOPERATIVE'S RESPONSES TO THE HAWAII RENEWABLE ENERGY ALLIANCE'S INFORMATION REQUESTS ISSUED JULY 28, 2004

AND

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

OSHIMA CHUN FONG & CHUNG LLP

Alan M. Oshima, Esq. Kent D. Morihara, Esq. Davies Pacific Center 841 Bishop Street Suite 400 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Telephone: (808) 528-4200

Attorneys for KAUAI ISLAND UTILITY COOPERATIVE

OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

In the Matter of)	
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION)	Docket No. 03-0371
Instituting a Proceeding to Investigate Distributed Generation in Hawaii.)))	

KAUAI ISLAND UTILITY COOPERATIVE'S RESPONSES TO THE HAWAII RENEWABLE ENERGY ALLIANCE'S INFORMATION REQUESTS ISSUED JULY 28, 2004

COMES NOW, KAUAI ISLAND UTILITY COOPERATIVE, by and through its attorneys, Oshima Chun Fong & Chung, hereby submits its Responses to the Hawaii Renewable Energy Alliance's Information Requests issued July 28, 2004.

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, August 18, 2004.

ALAN M. OSHIMA KENT D. MORIHARA

Karo ~

Attorneys for KAUAI ISLAND UTILITY COOPERATIVE

HREA-KIUC-T-1-IR-1

On page 12, you describe the potential impacts of DG in terms of a "slower build up of equity, reduced margins and ultimately a reduction in patronage capital retirements to the members." To a lay person, this sounds a lot like the potential impacts of DG to an investor-owned utility and its shareholders. How would you contrast the challenges/opportunities of KIUC's operation as a cooperative in meeting the needs of its members with the challenges/opportunities of KIUC's operation if as an IOU in meeting the needs of its shareholders?

Response:

The single major difference of an electric cooperative vs. an investor owned electric utility is that the members are the shareholders, and as such their respective interests and objectives in the end are one and the same. In contrast, for an IOU, the shareholders are an entirely different entity, and as such, the interests and objectives of the shareholders (e.g., increased revenues) may often contradict and conflict with the interests and objectives of the

customers/ratepayers (e.g., lower rates).

Sponsor:

Mike Yamane

HREA-KIUC-T-2-IR-1

HREA concludes from your testimony that the introduction of DG to KIUC's grid is an unnecessary complication at this time and could result in negative impacts to the system and KIUC's members. Is this an incorrect conclusion? If so, why?

Response:

This is an incorrect statement. As noted in KIUC-T-2 (pages 24-26), certain forms of DG may offer benefits to KIUC and its members, including lower air emissions, T&D construction deferral, and increased system security; and customer benefits as well (see KIUC-T-2, page 20, lines 13-17). KIUC believes that if DG is to be introduced to KIUC's grid, utility ownership should be allowed and even encouraged on Kauai.

Sponsor:

Mike Yamane

HREA-KIUC-T-2-IR-2

On page 2 (line11), have you identified specific locations where there are lightly load feeders? If so, where are they?

Response:

No. KIUC has not identified specific locations of lightly loaded feeders. However, KIUC notes that its statement to "lightly loaded feeders" as it pertains to its feeders was made in the context of the feeder loads experienced by many utilities on the mainland. In that context, KIUC believes its feeders are lightly loaded in comparison, which is largely due to the infrastructure build out that

occurred after Hurricane Iniki in 1992.

Sponsor:

Mike Yamane

HREA-KIUC-T-2-IR-3

On page 4 (line 9), are you making the argument that a customer that leaves the system should pay an exit fee? On the other hand, wouldn't it be more appropriate to refund any "hook-up" fees that the customer paid to enter (join) the system?

Response:

Hook-up fees are generally imposed for the engineering and other costs incurred by KIUC to connect a customer to KIUC's system. They cover expenses that occur prior to, during, or immediately after connecting a customer. As such, they should not have to be refunded if that customer later decides to disconnect from the system.

At this time, KIUC has not determined if exit fees would apply and has no policy in place as to how and to whom such fees would apply. KIUC's mention of an exit fee is purely to present this as an option to recover any stranded costs that may be incurred if a customer were to adopt non-emergency generation. KIUC does not intend at this time to apply any future exit fees to customers who wish to terminate their service from KIUC for any other reason provided that they have given appropriate notice of termination of service as dictated by the terms and conditions of the KIUC service agreement.

Sponsor:

Mike Yamane

HREA-KIUC-T-2-IR-4

On page 21 - 23, regarding the impacts of non-utility vs. utility investments in DG (and especially CHP), while there are potential rate impacts due to revenue losses from installation of non-utility DG, would not there also be rate impacts if the utility installed and rate-based DG? Have you compared the potential rate impacts for both cases, i.e., non-utility vs. utility-owned DG?

Response:

As an electric cooperative, it is KIUC's belief that its future rate studies will be based upon financial indicators required by its lenders (such as equity build-up and TIER) and not by the traditional rate-of-return analysis utilized for investor-owned utilities. By having the ability to evaluate DG on a case-by-case basis and then owning and operating DG systems when beneficial to KIUC's members/customers, KIUC will be able to ensure that DG has as positive an impact to its members/customers as possible.

KIUC has not performed any studies evaluating potential rate impacts of utility vs. non-utility owned DG.

Sponsor:

Joe McCawley

HREA-KIUC-T-2-IR-5

On page 25, can you provide some examples of how "DG can complicate system operations and offer unexpected impacts affecting system stability and personnel and customer safety?"

Response:

Installing a DG on a distribution line changes the characteristics of this line from a radial system (one electrical source originating from a distribution substation) to a looped system (multiple electrical sources on different sections of the line). Changing the characteristics of the line in such a manner will raise the level of complexities involved for switching programs, line maintenance, and relay protection. For example, line personnel and system operators will need to treat this line differently from the rest of the distribution system due to the DG. Also, if not done properly, synchronizing DG back into the electrical system after a fault can cause system instability and voltage excursion. While these issues are common for a transmission system, they are very unique to a distribution system.

Sponsor:

Joe M^cCawley

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I (we) hereby certify that copies of the foregoing document were duly served on the

following parties, by having said copies delivered as set forth below:

DIVISION OF CONSUMER ADVOCACY 335 Merchant Street Room 326 Honolulu, HI 96813	3 copies. Hand Delivery
THOMAS W. WILLIAMS, JR., ESQ. PETER Y. KIKUTA, ESQ. Goodsill, Anderson, Quinn & Stifel Alii Place, Suite 1800 1099 Alakea Street Honolulu, Hawaii 96813	1 copy U.S. Mail
MR. WILLIAM A. BONNET Vice President Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. Hawaii Electric Light Company, Inc. Maui Electric Company, Limited P. O. Box 2750 Honolulu, Hawaii 96840-0001	1 copy U.S. Mail
MS. PATSY H. NANBU Hawaiian Electric Company, Inc. P. O. Box 2750 Honolulu, Hawaii 96840-0001	1 copy U.S. Mail
MR. ALTON MIYAMOTO President & CEO Kauai Island Utility Cooperative 4463 Pahe'e Street Lihue, Hawaii 96766	1 copy U.S. Mail
BRIAN T. MOTO, ESQ. CORPORATION COUNSEL. County of Maui Department of the Corporation Counsel 200 S. High Street Wailuku, HI 96793	1 copy U.S. Mail
CINDY Y. YOUNG, ESQ. DEPUTY CORPORATION COUNSEL County of Maui Department of the Corporation Counsel 200 S. High Street Wailuku, HI 96793	1 copy U.S. Mail

MR. KALVIN K. KOBAYASHI ENERGY COORDINATOR County of Maui Department of Management 200 S. High Street Wailuku, HI 96793	1 copy U.S. Mail
MR. WARREN S. BOLLMEIER II PRESIDENT Hawaii Renewable Energy Alliance 46-040 Konane Place, #3816 Kaneohe, Hawaii 96744	1 copy U.S. Mail
MR. JOHN CROUCH Box 38-4276 Waikoloa, HI 96738	1 copy U.S. Mail
MR. RICK REED Inter Island Solar Supply 761 Ahua Street Honolulu, HI 96819	1 copy U.S. Mail
MR. HENRY CURTIS Life of the Land 76 North King Street, Suite 203 Honolulu, HI 96817	3 copies U.S. Mail
SANDRA –ANN Y. H. WONG, ESQ. 1050 Bishop Street, #514 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813	1 copy U.S. Mail
CHRISTOPHER S. COLMAN, ESQ. Deputy General Counsel Amerada Hess Corporation One Hess Plaza Woodbridge, N.J. 07095	1 copy U.S. Mail
MR. MICHAEL DE'MARSI Hess Microgen 4101 Halburton Road Raleigh, NC 27614	1 copy U.S. Mail
LANI D. H. NAKAZAWA, ESQ. Office of the County Attorney County of Kauai 4444 Rice Street, Suite 220 Lihue, HI 96766	2 copies U.S. Mail

MR. GLENN SATO ENERGY COORDINATOR c/o Office of the County Attorney County of Kauai 4444 Rice Street, Suite 220 Lihue, HI 96766 1 copy U.S. Mail

JOHN W. K. CHANG, ESQ. Deputy Attorney General Department of the Attorney General State of Hawaii 425 Queen Street Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 1 copy U.S. Mail

DATED: Honolulu, Hawai'i, August 18, 2004.

ALAN M. OSHIMA KENT D. MORIHARA

Knoon

Attorneys for KAUAI ISLAND UTILITY COOPERATIVE